EXHIBIT 35

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - BERGEN COUNTY

CRIMINAL PART

INDICTMENT NO. 95-07-0889

APP. DIV. NO.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,

Complainant,

TRANSCRIPT

vs.

:

OF

JAMIE FARTHING,

SENTENCE

Defendant.

Place: Bergen County Courthouse

10 Main Street

Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

Date: February 2, 2001

BEFORE:

HONORABLE TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN, J.S.C.

TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:

Office of the Public Defender, Appellate Section

APPEARANCES:

PATRICIA BAGLIVI, ESQ., Assistant Prosecutor, Attorney for the State.

JOHN L. WEICHSEL, ESQ., Attorneys for the Defendant.

Video recorded by: N/A

RAPID TRANSCRIPT SERVICE, INC.

Stefanie Lucas, Trainee 4 Elodie Lane Randolph, New Jersey 07869

(973)328-1730 FAX (973) 328-8016

INDEX 2/2/01 2

ARGUMENT	, <u>Page</u>
By Mr. Weichsel By Ms. Baglivi	4, 11 8
COURT SENTENCE	12

Sentence 3

All right. This is the matter

THE COURT: All right. This is the matter of The State of New Jersey v. Jamie Farthing.

Your appearances, Counsels, please?

MS. BAGLIVI: Patricia Baglivi, Assistant

Prosecutor for the State.

MR. WEICHSEL: John Weichsel, 79 Main Street, Hackensack, for Jamie Farthing.

THE COURT: We have received from the Appellate Division decision wherein they set aside the verdict of the jury regarding Count No. -- which one was it? The knowing and purposely murder, which is Count No. Seven involving James Politas (phonetic).

The Appellate Division also recommended -not recommended, but directed a -- that the matter be
retried if the State wishes to do so.

What's the State's position on this?

MS. BAGLIVI: No, Judge. We will not retry the murder since they've left the founding murder conviction alone.

THE COURT: All right. So let the record reflect that the State has withdrawn its Count No. Seven of the Indictment No. 889-95, which is knowing and purposely causing the death of James Politas.

Otherwise, the Count Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven,

Twelve, Thirteen are all -- she has been found guilty 1 2 of all of those. MS. BAGLIVI: One, Two, Three and Four. 3 4 THE COURT: And One, Two, Three and Four, 5 involving Mr. Hipman (phonetic) here in Hackensack and we are here now to restructure the sentencing. 6 7 Is that correct? 8 MS. BAGLIVI: Correct. 9 MR. WEICHSEL: That's correct, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Weichsel, do you want to be heard on that before I --11 12 MR. WEICHSEL: Very briefly, Judge. The original sentence of the Court was 13 14 life --15 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Did you get the 16 update of the -- I had an update of her record for today's purposes, 17 18 MR. WEICHSEL: No, I did not --19 MS. BAGLIVI: No, I did not. 20 MR. WEICHSEL: -- Judge. 21 THE COURT: Well, I'd just then -- well, let me show it to you and then hand it back to me. 22 23 (Court confers with clerk) 24 MR. WEICHSEL: Judge, I've read it. 25 That's in accord with my understanding.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear you,
Mr. Weichsel.

MR. WEICHSEL: I've had an opportunity to read that, Judge.

The original sentence of this Court was life, plus 60, with a parole disqualifier of 40 years. The Appellate Division has now reversed the conviction of a purposeful and knowing murder and the Court must resentence Ms. Farthing.

Since she has been incarcerated, Judge,
Ms. Farthing has taken advantage of opportunities at
prison in terms of work and schooling. She is now
working at a telemarketing job and doing data entry.
She is working double shifts, sometimes from 8 a.m.
to 9 p.m. and she's being paid the munificent sum of
53 cents per hour out of which the State takes the
various VCCB and DEDR penalties that were imposed by
the Court, as well as a two-dollar transaction fee.

She is on a list to get into college. She is doing whatever she can to rehabilitate herself to eventually become a useful citizen of society. She has also had a long time, since this trial was in the fall of 1996, to reflect and think about what happened during these incidents which occurred back in 1994. She has been incarcerated now approximately

Sentence

almost seven years, Judge.

I would ask the Court, in fashioning a sentence for Ms. Farthing, to consider both her age at the time of the offense, the level of culpability of Ms. Farthing, to the codefendants Ivy DeMolina (phonetic) and Thomas Christopher James. I would ask the Court to take all of that into account. I would ask the Court, in fashioning a sentence, to give Ms. Farthing some hope.

On the felony murder, Judge, the minimum sentence that she must receive is 30 years without parole and that is obvious, Judge. Originally, the Court sentenced the kidnapping and the armed robbery consecutive to the felony murder -- the purposeful and knowing murder.

The Court was under the impression that it must sentence the kidnapping consecutively. I do not believe that is the case. That is something which was raised on appeal, but not dealt with by the Appellate Division, due to the fact that the matter was being remanded to your court for resentencing, in light of the Appellate Division's opinion.

I would ask the Court to fashion a sentence that while obviously it's going to be extremely punitive as to Ms. Farthing will give her

The

for

-cv	-00572-CCC Document 11-35 Filed 02/10/11 Page 8 of 24 PageID:
	Sentence
	some hope, some light at the end of the tunnel. The
	earliest she could ever be hope to be eligible for
	parole would be at the age 48 years, after having
	served 30 years. I ask the Court to sentence Ms.
	Farthing to a 30-year sentence with a period of
	parole ineligibility for 30 years and the sentences
	on the other counts be concurrent with those
	sentences.
	I've had an opportunity to review the
	sentencing memorandum prepared by the State. I
	disagree with the State contentions and I would ask
	the Court to seriously consider that in light of what
	Ms. Farthing has done in prison and in light of the
	fact that the Appellate Division reversing the
	purposeful and knowing murder.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Weichsel, with the sentence that was imposed by the courts in the State of New York, was that imposed to run consecutive or concurrent to her sentence --

MR. WEICHSEL: I believe that sentence was to run concurrent. That's my client's understanding.

THE COURT: Concurrent to the New Jersey sentence?

MR. WEICHSEL: Concurrent to the New

1	Jersey sentence. That's my client's and I have
2	seen nothing in writing from New York, but that's my
3	client's understanding.
4	(Counsel confers with client)
5	THE COURT: It doesn't indicate in the
6	information that I received.
7	Do you know whether it was consecutive
8	MS. BAGLIVI: No. I just
9	THE COURT: or not?
10	MS. BAGLIVI: saw what was in that
11	document, but I do believe it was concurrent.
12	THE COURT: All right.
13	Ms. Farthing, you have anything you want
14	to say?
15	MR. WEICHSEL: I had excuse me, Judge.
16	THE COURT: Do you have anything you want
17	to say? I did receive your letter? Is that it?
18	MS. BAGLIVI: I wasn't aware there was a
19	letter submitted. Is there anything the State could
20	address or know about?
21	THE COURT: No. She was you want to see
22	it?
23	MR. WEICHSEL: 'I haven't seen it either,
24	Judge.
25	THE COURT: All right.

MS. BAGLIVI: Judge, I'll just be brief in my comments. I --

THE COURT: I don't where it is.
Go ahead.

MS. BAGLIVI: Judge, I did submit a sentencing brief on this matter and, Judge, the Appellate Division did reverse the purposeful or knowing, but there is still the felony murder it left to be sentenced on and murder is murder, if the legislature has determined that it should be 30 years minimum up to life in prison.

Judge, I don't think in resentencing her on the felony murder, the Court -- Mr. Weichsel will stand here and say, well, things have changed. Ms. Farthing is now working; she's trying to make her -- a life better for herself; she's wanted to get into college and take correspondence courses and all of things, I guess, he's saying should mitigate in you lowering her sentence.

Judge, what I would point out is and what Mr. Weichsel fails to point out is that may be true, that she is now trying to better her life, but at the time she was sentenced, what you didn't have before the Court, what you have now before you is the fact that she's been convicted of a second murder in New

York.

At the time you sentenced her on the first one, you sentenced her to life, 30 years without parole on the murder and she had no priors other than that minor thing down in Georgia. But, Your Honor, I submitted the Court's transcript to Your Honor because I know it was many years ago. I submitted it to Mr. Weichsel. Your Honor pointed out that this was a diabolical act, a diabolical episode. This woman showed no remorse. She hog-tied Mr. Politas and then participated in all these crimes that led to the death of Mr. Politas.

So at the time, Your Honor, even without a prior murder, you gave her life, 30 years without parole. Now she comes before you and she says, well, I'm working, I want to go to college, I want a life, I want to see light at the end of the tunnel. Well, Judge, the fact is that she's now convicted of another crime and I'm not saying give her more of a sentence, but I'm saying it's almost the same sentence.

It is murder. Our legislatures determine whether it's felony murder or purposeful or knowing murder. It's still life, 30 years without parole.

Then Mr. Weichsel says, well, I would like concurrent

sentences and I don't know if he's referring to concurrent with the Hipman crimes or just concurrent with the kidnapping and as I pointed out in my brief and I did submit a copy of the Appellate Division brief by the Attorney General that while it was not required or was not -- Your Honor was not obligated to give a consecutive sentence for the kidnapping of Mr. Politas and the murder of Mr. Politas, the Court could do so and found a lot of different factors here.

And, as I pointed out in my brief, the goals of the kidnapping and the murder were different goals here. They were -- the kidnapping, the hogtying of Mr. Politas was done to facilitate the commission of the robbery; so that they could ransack his house and take his property.

That is a different goal and a different objective than the killing. The killing was done -- and Your Honor heard the testimony -- it was done so that -- not Jamie Farthing -- so that Ivy DeMolina could escape detection. So the goals here were completely different.

And while I realize it's the same victim and it is discretionary with the Court, the Court can impose a kidnapping consecutive to the felony murder,

Sentence

armed robbery and that would be perfectly proper and I think the facts in this case bear it out.

But that be said, I think there's no reason to give her a concurrent sentence to the Hipman crime because, Judge, you have separate victims, separate days. As Your Honor pointed out in the transcript, different harms on different victims. To give her anything less than life, 30 years without parole, when in reality if she in fact got a concurrent sentence in New York, she got a free crime anyway.

I think life, plus 60, 40 years without parole is an appropriate sentence and I would ask that you only just change the life, 30 years without parole on the murder and then put that on the felony murder, life, 30 years without parole and keep everything else -- keep everything, all the other sentences the same with regards to --

THE COURT: You're --

MS. BAGLIVI: -- concurrent --

THE COURT: -- asking for life on the felony murder?

MS. BAGLIVI: Right. Life, 30 years without parole on the felony murder.

THE COURT: Okay. I got you.

respond?

MR. WEICHSEL: Judge, can I briefly

THE COURT: Yes.

I --

MR. WEICHSEL: Obviously, when the Court sentenced Ms. Farthing on February 14th, 1997, the Court was aware of the New York murder charges at the time. I don't think that's any different than what we have before the count -- before the Court now.

Number two, Judge, in terms of the kidnapping being consecutive. The Court is now sentencing Ms. Farthing on two counts of felony murder. Felony murder, kidnapping felony murder, robbery. I'm asking the Court to exercise its discretion, not to make the kidnapping consecutive to the felony murder.

I'm also asking the Court, in light of the fact that the purposeful and knowing murder was reversed, to sentence Ms. Farthing to 30 years with no parole eligibility for 30 years on the felony murder, with that being the sentence.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I understand what you're asking. I understand what the State's asking.

16.

I had an opportunity to -- with -- the Prosecutor submitted a memorandum with regard to this sentencing.

Now, Ms. Farthing, would you please stand?

And I had an opportunity -- they

submitted, and I appreciate it, my -- the sentencing

transcript of when I did sentence Ms. Farthing back

in February of 1997, initially, and I read it over

again and it brought back a great deal of my own

feelings and my own thoughts about this case.

I guess what happens when you sit on these kinds of cases is that you kind of -- in order to live your life, one's life -- attorneys are the same, I suppose, as judges. There are certain things you block out and you just move on. You remember the case, but there are some of the details in the case that a family never can block out. But somehow you let it go.

But, you know, when I read the transcript again after -- it's almost three years to the day.

No. Let's see. Four years, four years to the day and it just churned up everything again as to what was involved in this case and my findings at the time and how we all struggled with it; and how I initially had said that everybody in the courtroom was a loser,

including the defendant, the families.

And I even quoted Mr. Cosby, if you remember, he had just lost his son and some kind of reference to the fact that how -- what a family feels like and his reference was that you only -- you have to be a parent to have lost a child to understand how he felt and I expressed that with regard to the Politas family. I could not imagine the feeling.

And I remember reviewing those kinds of situations.

None of that's changed, you see. And that's what I read in the transcript. Those elements are there. I made findings at the time regarding Ms. Farthing and those findings have changed very little. Knowledge and purpose of the -- knowing and purposely knowing Mr. Politas, I could understand when I went through the Appellate Division's review of the case, how we -- very possibly, it wasn't there legal wise that she had full knowledge of what was going on.

We weren't -- the State didn't prove it using the evidence they had. I have no quarrel at all with the Appellate Division's decision on the matter. In fact, I appreciate the fact that they considered the rest of the case and affirmed it.

So here we are. They're asking us now to -- in light of their decision that we resentence

or restructure the sentence and I go back over the findings that I made at the time of the original sentence and I adopt them and they become part of this record as my findings and basically, I'll just go through them quickly.

With regard to Count One, which is the kidnapping of Robert Hipman. You -- I had sentenced you and -- to a sentence of 30 years and on the robbery, Count Two, I sentenced you to 20 years with a 10-year period of parole ineligibility. Possession of a gun for unlawful purpose, a Graves Act, which merged with Number Two, which gives you the reason for the stip, as well as the factors of the stip on the first degree armed robbery; then for the possession of the weapon without a permit.

When I was reading this particular transcript again, I was reminded of the fact that the role you played in Mr. Hipman's kidnapping and robbery was one in which Mr. Hipman, by some stroke, was not murdered by your gang. He testified and was able to tell us what happened and you were the one with the gun and you were the one that put the gun to his head and he said that. He said, she did it.

So to me that was a separate and distinct crime from the Edgewater crime and any sentence this

Court imposes, for the same reasons I stated in my record back in February 14th, 1997, shall run consecutive to the sentence I impose. I am not changing that.

So the aggregate sentence with regards to Counts One, Two -- Count Two and Three were merged. So Count One, Two and Four are 30 years for kidnapping, 20 years with a 10 stip date and five years for the possession of the weapon. They will run concurrent. The total aggregate of that is 30 years with 10 years period of parole ineligibility.

Now with regard to Count No. Seven, that has been withdrawn by the Prosecutor's Office. You have been found guilty of felony murder. The felony being kidnapping and Count Eight and Count Nine felony murder, with regard to armed robbery on Count Nine, involving the death of Mr. Politas.

I'm sentencing -- and I'm considering the fact that now I have definitely before me, aside from the other aggravating factors, you have a second murder, which is a -- out of Rivers Edge, New York.

You were arrested on June 11th, 1997, Suffern County New York on July 2, 1997.

You were sentenced to second degree murder for 15 years to life on an -- a felony and that was

the death -- I don't know who that individual was, but he was part of that whole rampage that you people were on. So now I have that to consider too, in imposing a sentence here on the felony murder.

Count Eight and Count Nine will be sentenced separately. They do not now merge with Count Seven as they did originally. Count Eleven, which is the armed robbery, will merge with Count Twelve, being the possession of the gun -- of the weapon, that is a gun, for unlawful purposes. Count Thirteen, the possession of weapon without a permit. You -- I'm imposing a sentence of five years and that will -- well, they'll all run concurrent.

All right. It's the sentence of this

Court and I find that the aggravating factors

substantially outweigh the mitigating factors, as I

found originally. They have not changed.

Nothing has changed, Ms. Farthing, except that you are spending your last couple of years in jail -- in prison and making the best of it which is good.

On Count Eight, felony murder, you are, hereby, sentenced to be placed in the custody of the Commissioner of Corrections for the rest of your life. I'm giving you a life sentence on that with

30-year period of parole ineligibility.

On Count Nine, felony murder, regarding the armed robbery. You are sentenced to life imprisonment with 30 years without parole.

On Count Ten, the kidnapping count of the first degree, you will receive a 30-year sentence. I will not impose a stip on that.

Counts Eleven and Twelve merge for armed robbery. Count One, an armed robbery in the first degree. You're sentenced to 20 years with a 10-year period of parole ineligibility as regards the Graves Act. There was use of a gun. With regard to Count Thirteen, possession of a gun without a permit. You will receive a sentence of five years.

The total aggregate of the -- on the Count Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven and Twelve merging and Thirteen, they'll run concurrent with each other. You will receive a life sentence, an aggregate of life imprisonment with a 30-year period of parole ineligibility and all of this will run consecutive to the aggregate with -- regarding the -- Mr. Hipman's robbery, which is 30 years with a 10-year parole ineligibility.

When you total it all out, I come up with life imprisonment with 40 years period of parole

1 ineligibility. 2 Is that what you get? 3 MS. BAGLIVI: Yes. 4 MR. WEICHSEL: Yeah. 5 THE COURT: That is the aggregate sentence 6 in this case. All other matters, the Victims of 7 Violent Crimes Compensation -- I think there might be 8 a problem in that one. I just ran across it 9 because -- what did I impose? 10 MR. WEICHSEL: I thought it was 2,500. 11 MS. BAGLIVI: Well, \$2,500 on VCCB. So --12 THE COURT: Yeah. I'm going to reduce 13 I did get a case since then and that there has 14 to be a showing that she's able to pay that. 15 MS. BAGLIVI: Even the VCCB? 16 THE COURT: Yeah. I was imposing it at 17 the time -- I did it with another case too, where I 18 felt the heinousness of the crime raised the VCCB, 19 but they -- I got it back and it said you can't do this. 20 21 MR. WEICHSEL: Oh. So you had imposed a 2,000-dollar VCCB on Count Seven, which is now --22 23

THE COURT: So that's now dropped.

MR. WEICHSEL: That's --

24

25

THE COURT: That's out.

1 MS. BAGLIVI: You're giving the minimum? 2 THE COURT: No. On the Violent Crimes, 3 it's -- the minimum is 100. MS. BAGLIVI: \$100. 4 5 THE COURT: So it's \$100 on each one of 6 the violent crimes and \$50 on the -- you know, for 7 example, the possession of the weapon without a 8 permit and we'll fix that up. We'll add it all up, 9 but the \$2,000 that I imposed upon the knowing and purposely murder is now void also. You have 45 days to appeal the sentence, if you don't agree with it. If you can't afford an attorney, you can apply for the Public Defender's Office for assistance. As far as jail credit is concerned -- and I'm not sure. I guess this is a sentence where she'll get jail credit for all the time she's been in? MS. BAGLIVI: Right. MR. WEICHSEL: Yes, Judge. THE COURT: And she -- I think we have her here starting when she was arrested on September 18th, 1994. Is that when you were arrested? MR. WEICHSEL: That's --MS. BAGLIVI: It's August of '94.

MR. WEICHSEL: September 18th is when she

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

days more. No, no. I gave her seven days because we sentenced --

MS. BAGLIVI: The sentencing --

THE COURT: -- her on --

MS. BAGLIVI: -- was moved. Right.

MR. WEICHSEL: Right.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Farthing, good

luck.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BAGLIVI: Did you tell her about her

appeal?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MR. WEICHSEL: What?

THE COURT: Yeah, I have -- you have 45 days to appeal the sentence if you don't agree or you can't afford an attorney, you can apply with the Public Defender's Office.

MS. BAGLIVI: Thank you.

(Proceedings concluded)

I, STEFANIE LUCAS, the assigned transcriber, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings in the Bergen County Superior Court on February 2, 2001, Videotape, as indexed by the Court, is prepared in full compliance with the current Transcript Format for Judicial Proceedings and is a true and acqurate/record of the proceedings. Stefanie Lucae, Trainee

Date:

Proofed by: Michele Vicaro, AD/T 352 RAPID TRANSCRIPT SERVICE, INC.